

EA



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,266	12/21/2001	Mario D'Amico	86052-6	4982

28291 7590 06/24/2005

FETHERSTONHAUGH - SMART & BIGGAR  
1000 DE LA GAUCHETIERE WEST  
SUITE 3300  
MONTREAL, QC H3B 4W5  
CANADA

EXAMINER
----------

ZEENDER, FLORIAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/024,266

Applicant(s)

D'AMICO ET AL.

Examiner

F. Ryan Zeender

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1, 16, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tran '742.

Tran discloses or inherently teaches all of the limitations of the claims including: delivering information to a user from a computer prompting the user to enter information identifying a project, perform an action specifying a billing-related information, provide information not related to billing-related information (See, for example Figs. 11 and 12).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 2-15, 17-32, and 34-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran '742.

Tran disclose all of the limitations of the claims including: generating a first message including billing information (See for example Fig. 11, numeral "412"); generating a second message including information identifying a project and information associated to the project but unrelated to billing information (See for example Fig. 12, numeral "438"); but the reference lacks the specific teaching of sending the first message and second message to different destinations, specifically the second message to a knowledge database.

It would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have separate, but linked, databases for billing information and unrelated information (for example "Attendees"; numeral 438 in Tran) as is known

Art Unit: 3627

in the art in order to separate personal notes from professional information or to provide a means for selective access to information.

Re claims 15, 29-31, 43-45: searching software is well known for their use with databases.

Re claims 18, 20-21, 35: It would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the CPU reside on a server machine in a network environment, as this type of arrangement is well known in order to have access and control by the server.

Re claim 24: Selecting destinations is well known in software (i.e., Microsoft Windows) in order to provide organization for data.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 13 of the response, last paragraph, the applicant argues that the attendees field "438" in Tran is related to billing because it is "travel-related expense information". The Examiner disagrees with the applicant for two reasons. Firstly, personal names of attendees to an activity (***which is different than the name of the Client 431***) have nothing to do with the billing of the client and these personal names are usually not included in the development of a bill to the client. Secondly, even though Tran considers the attendees field travel-related expense information, an expense is not necessarily related to actual billing of a client. For example, a user

Art Unit: 3627

might incur an "expense" for laundry (See Tran, Col. 19, line 2) while on business travel, but clients are rarely, if ever, billed for this. Therefore, it cannot be considered related to **"billing"**.

On page 15, applicant argues that Tran is concerned **exclusively** with the production of an efficient billing system and therefore it would not have been obvious to have a message generated with information NOT related to billing and the message sent to a different destination than the billing related information. This is not convincing because Tran **is** concerned with information not necessarily related to billing (*see for example the information regarding "attendees" mentioned above, as well as the "Reports" button 424 taught by Tran*), and it would have been an obvious design choice to treat this information differently than the billing-related information for the reasons given in the rejection above.

Re claims 13, 32, 46: The applicant argues that "project notes" are in no way related to "attendees" information. However, this is not convincing in that the "notes" for a project would often include the names of attendees to an activity, in order to document contact information in order to have future questions regarding the activity answered.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Ryan Zeender whose telephone number is (571) 272-6790. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8am-5pm.

Art Unit: 3627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The receptionist's phone number for the Technology center is (703) 308-1113.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

F. Zeender  
Primary Examiner, A.U. 3627  
June 22, 2005

 6/22/05  
F. RYAN ZEENDER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER